

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-31 are currently pending in the subject application. Claims 1, 12 and 30 are independent. Claims 1, 5, 12, 18, 30, and 31 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the independent claims may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0027] and [0029] of the original specification.

A. Introduction

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final,

- 1) claim 18 was objected to because of language informalities;
- 2) claims 8, 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention;
- 3) claims 1-4, 6, 9-13 and 15-19 and 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,009,652 to Tanida et al. (“the Tanida et al. reference”);
- 4) claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,319 to Bills (“the Bills reference”);
- 5) claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,137,535 to Meyers (“the Meyers reference”);
- 6) claims 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of Examiner’s Official Notice; and
- 7) claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,355,222 to Heller et al. (“the Heller et al. reference”).

B. Objection to Claim 18

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claim 18 was objected to because “between” should be changed to “closer” as in claims 17 and 19. Claim 18 has been amended as requested. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

C. Asserted Indefiniteness Rejections of Claims 8, 10 and 20

In the outstanding Office action, claims 8, 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the phrase “the selected transform matrix.” Claims 1 and 12, from which claims 8 and 10, and 20, respectively depend, have been amended to provide antecedent basis. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

D. Asserted Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 9-13 and 15-19 and 21-30

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claims 1-4, 6, 9-13 and 15-19 and 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Tanida et al. reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

In the response to arguments, filter 4 of FIG. 8 of the Tanida et al. reference was noted as being the multiple sub-pixel resolution element since it corresponds to the pixels 3a of FIG. 1 therein.¹ However, as each block 4a corresponds to one unit, i.e., is associated with multiple pixels 4a and provides the same signal across these multiple pixels, these blocks 4a cannot be considered to be a sub-pixel resolution elements.

Further, claims 1, 12 and 30 have been amended to clarify that “an output of the plurality of detectors together representing an input image multiplied by a selected transform matrix.” The individual polarizing filters 4a of the Tanida et al. reference do not provide such a multiplied image.

¹ *Office Action Made Final*, mailed June 30, 2008, page 1.

Therefore, the Tanida et al. reference fails to disclose or even suggest the sub-pixel resolution elements recited in claims 1, 12, and 30. The remaining rejected claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from respective ones of claims 1 and 12, and are similarly believed to be allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

E. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claim 5

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of the Bills reference. The Bills reference fails to provide the teachings noted above as missing from the Tanida et al. reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable for at least the reason its base claim 1 is allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

F. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 7 and 14

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of the Meyers reference. The Meyers reference fails to provide the teachings noted above as missing from the Tanida et al. reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 14 are allowable for at least the reason discussed above regarding claims 1 and 12. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

G. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 8 and 20

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claims 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of the Examiner's Official Notice. The portion of the Tanida et al. reference relied upon regarding the selected transform matrix in the Office action² is merely directed to the output signals arising from use of the microlens array 1, not any matrix multiplier of an input image.

² *Id.*, page 14.

Further, the Official notice fails to provide the teachings noted above as missing from the Tanida et al. reference.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above regarding claims 1 and 12. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

H. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claim 31

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tanida et al. reference in view of the Heller et al. reference. The Heller et al. reference fails to provide the teachings noted above as missing from the Tanida et al. reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 31 is allowable for at least the reason discussed above regarding claim 30, from which claim 31 depends. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

I. Conclusion

The above remarks demonstrate failings of the Examiner's rationales for the outstanding rejections, and are sufficient to overcome the outstanding rejections. However, these remarks are not intended to, nor need they, comprehensively address each and every reason for the patentability of the claimed subject matter over the applied art. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for reasons including, but not limited to, those set forth above, and patentability of the claims does not depend solely on the particular claim element discussed above.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: September 30, 2008


Susan S. Morse, Reg. No. 35,292

LEE & MORSE, P.C.
3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 500
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042
703.207.0008 TEL
703.207.0003 FAX

PETITION and
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.